

REMARKS

Claims 28-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 28 is amended. Support for the amendments to the claim may be found, for example, in the specification at page 11, lines 4-16. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,820,779 to Shouji et al. ("Shouji"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, "An optical low-pass filter, comprising: a laminated product formed by laminating a plurality of sheets of a polymer material ... and an interface of the laminated product making a predetermined angle, which is more than 0 degrees, relative to an entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter where light flux enters, wherein the interface of the laminated product extends diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter." Applicants respectfully assert that Shouji does not disclose at least the above features of claim 28.

The Office Action asserts that Shouji discloses a laminated product with an interface making a predetermined angle relative to a surface of the optical low-pass filter. See Office Action, page 3. Additionally, the Office Action asserts that the predetermined angle was not previously defined in the claims and, thus, the Office Action asserts that any angle may disclose the "predetermined angle" recited in claim 28. *Id.* In support of this assertion, the Office Action exemplifies three parallel sheets laminated together, and asserts that the edge surface of the resulting product makes a 90 degree angle with respect to the surface of the low-pass filter. *Id.* Therefore, the Office Action appears to assert that any laminated

structure would form a "predetermined angle" relative to a surface of the optical low-pass filter.

However, claim 28 recites that the predetermined angle is "relative to an entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter where light flux enters, wherein the interface of the laminated product extends diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter." Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action's example of three parallel sheets laminated together would not disclose these features of claim 28. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Shouji also fails to disclose these features of claim 28.

Shouji merely discloses, in one example, that three optically anisotropic polymer films were produced and laminated on one another with a commercially-available photosetting acrylic adhesive in a state that the slow axes of the respective films run parallel to one another, thereby obtaining a laminated optical low-pass filter. See Shouji, col. 12, lines 17-22. But, this example of Shouji does not disclose that the interface of the laminated product extends diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter. Rather, this example of Shouji discloses that the optically anisotropic polymer films are laminated one on top of each other so that the slow axes run parallel to one another. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shouji fails to disclose at least the above feature of claim 28.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 28 is not anticipated by Shouji. Claim 30 depends from claim 28 and likewise is not anticipated. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shouji in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,578,243 to Mazaki et al. ("Mazaki") and rejects claim 31 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) over Shouji in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,085 to Osawa et al. ("Osawa").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Office Action applies Shouji in the same manner as above. For at least the reasons stated above, Shouji fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 28. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that Shouji fails to provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the laminated product of its example 9 to have included interfaces of the laminated product that extend diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter at least because neither Shouji nor the Office Action provide any benefit or desirability for such a modification. Thus, Shouji would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of claim 28.

Additionally, Mazaki and Osawa are not applied by the Office Action to address the above discrepancy of Shouji as to claim 28. Specifically, Mazaki is applied as allegedly disclosing that polymer films for optical filters can be obtained by stretching a polymer film. See Office Action, page 4. Further, the Office Action merely applies Osawa as allegedly disclosing an optical filter that includes conductive coatings applied to front and back sides. See Office Action, page 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Shouji, Mazaki and Osawa, as applied in the Office Action, would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of claim 28.

Claim 28 would not have been rendered obvious by Shouji, Mazaki and Osawa, as applied in the Office Action. The remaining claims depend from claim 28 and likewise would not have been rendered obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Nicolas A. Brentlinger
Registration No. 62,211

MAC:NAB/mkg

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: November 23, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--